

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. Please amend claims 1, 3, 5, 17-18, 20-21, 23-26, 41, 46-49, 53 and 56. Claim 52 has been canceled. Claims 57 and 58 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-51 and 53-58 are pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Expertcity.com's Internet service, as disclosed in "Expertcity.com Launches Premier Online Marketplace for Expert Services" and "Rent-An-Expert on the Web" ("the Expertcity.com references") in view of answers.com, as disclosed in "Applying Technology News" ("the answers.com reference"). Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are patentable over the Expertcity.com and answers.com references. The cited references do not disclose, suggest or render obvious, either individually or in combination, all of the elements of the Applicants' claims.

Specifically, independent claim 1 includes the limitation: "to offer the previously recorded information to a plurality of users." Independent claims 26 and 41 each have a similar limitation. Applicants submit that neither the Expertcity.com references, nor the answers.com reference, alone or in combination, contain this limitation.

Rather, the Expertcity.com references disclose a customer entering problems on a website. ("Rent-An-Expert on the Web," p. 1). Experts bid on the opportunity to solve the problem and a customer selects an expert to solve the problem. ("Rent-An-Expert on the Web," p. 1). The information delivered to an Expertcity.com customer from the expert is "real-time," rather than being previously recorded. ("Expertcity.com Launches Premier Online Marketplace for Expert Services," p. 1). Additionally, the information is "personalized," provided to that particular customer according to that customer's individual problem, rather than being offered to a plurality of users. ("Expertcity.com Launches Premier Online Marketplace for Expert Services," p. 1). Therefore, the Expertcity.com references do not disclose the limitation of an offer of previously recorded information to a plurality of users.

Likewise, the answers.com reference does not disclose this limitation. Rather, the answers.com reference discloses a "search engine powered by

humans.” (“Applying Technology News,” p. 1). A customer types in a question. (“Applying Technology News,” p. 1). A “fellow human being” provides a “personal touch” by researching the answer to the question using a combination of published information, proprietary database, and electronic data from qualified people who provide their own personal knowledge. (“Applying Technology News,” p. 1). In other words, the information delivered to an answer.com customer is created by a human being using a variety of sources, rather than being previously recorded. Additionally, the answer is emailed to a particular customer in response to that customer’s individual question, rather than being offered to a plurality of users. Therefore, the answer.com reference also does not disclose the limitation of offering previously recorded information to a plurality of users.

Therefore, neither the Expertcity.com references, nor the answers.com reference, nor the combination thereof disclose or suggest the claimed limitations of independent claims 1, 26 and 41. Accordingly, the cited references do not render obvious claims 1, 26 and 41. Claims 2-25, 27-40, 42-51 and 53-56 depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the foregoing independent claims. Accordingly, the cited references also do not render obvious claims 2-25, 27-40, 42-51 and 53-56. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Van Nguy at (408) 720-8300, x228.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), Applicants hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/6/05



Van N. Nguy
Reg. No. 55,851

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Formal replacement drawings are included to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84.